

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-44 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-5, 9-13, 16, 22, 27, 29, and 34 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-9 of the Reply. Claims 8, 14, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31-33, and 35-44 have been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Mai for the courtesies extended during the telephonic conference on February 4, 2009, with Keith Drabek. During the conference, proposed amendments were discussed. No agreement was reached as to a particular form of amendment.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to Specification**

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter recited in claim 21. It is respectfully submitted that this objection is moot in view of the cancelation of claim 21 made herein.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-20 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 1 and cancelation of claims 8, 14, and 41 made herein.

**III. Rejection of Claims 22-33 and 42 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 22-33 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 22 and cancelation of claims 23, 26, 28, and 31-33 made herein.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 34-39 and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 34-39 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claim 34 and cancelation of claims 35-39 and 43 made herein.

**V. Rejection of Claims 1-44 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants' regard as the invention. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to claims 1, 22, and 34 made herein and cancelation of claims 8, 14, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31-33, and 35-44 made herein.

**VI. Rejection of Claims 1-10, 18-28, 34, and 38-44 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-10, 18-28, 34, and 38-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0165895) and Daniell (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0097174) in view of Wendkos *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0228899 A1). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: claims 8, 21, 23, 26, 28, and 38-44 have been canceled; and Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter is directed to mitigating accidental or unintentional exposure to offensive content. For example, a content blocking component can be employed to enable a user to preview a message that contains offensive message content in a preview pane, while partially blocking message content in the preview pane to mitigate viewing offensive message content. To these ends, independent claim 1, as amended, recites *a filtering component that identifies whether content of at least one message comprises text, one or more images, one or more sounds, one or more videos, one or more URLs, embedded content, one or more attachments, or one or more applets offensive to the user; and a content blocking component that partially blocks the content of the at least one message by preventing offensive portions thereof from being viewed or sensed from at least a preview pane that displays the at least one message.*

Rajan *et al.* is directed providing a plurality of appropriately labeled directories that contain e-mails suspected of being spam. Daniell is directed to systems and methods for managing the detection of undesired email messages. Examiner concedes that Rajan *et al.* fails to disclose blocking content from appearing in at least a preview pane. Further, Examiner concedes that Rajan *et al.* and Daniell fail to disclose partially blocking content.

Wendkos *et al.* is directed to electronic permission based communications. To this end, Wendkos *et al.* discloses requiring establishment of permission arrangements between subscribers of permission-based communications. (See Wendkos *et al.* at paragraph [0014]). Although Wendkos *et al.* discloses organizations can choose to strip out all images and links from incoming email to thwart exposure to offensive images and dangerous links (see Wendkos *et al.* at paragraph [0008] (emphasis added)), applicants' representative respectfully submits that Wendkos *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *a filtering component that identifies whether content of at least one message comprises text, one or more images, one or more sounds, one or more videos, one or more URLs, embedded content, one or more attachments, or one or more applets offensive to the user*; and *a content blocking component that partially blocks the content of the at least one message by preventing offensive portions thereof from being viewed or sensed from at least a preview pane that displays the at least one message*. Instead, the cited aspects of Wendkos *et al.* merely disclose all images and links are indiscriminately removed from text messages.

Dependent claim 2, as amended, recites *calculating a junk score for the at least one message; and a classification component that classifies the at least one message as any one of a good state, a junk state, and a middle state based in part on the junk score*; wherein *the middle state indicates that the at least one message is determined to be safe for an inbox, but not safe for viewing or previewing in at least the preview pane without partial blocking of content of the at least one message*. It is respectfully submitted that Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* fail to teach or suggest *calculating a junk score for the at least one message; and a classification component that classifies the at least one message as any one of a good state, a junk state, and a middle state based in part on the junk score*; wherein *the middle state indicates that the at least one message is determined to be safe for an inbox, but not safe for viewing or previewing in at least the preview pane without partial blocking of content of the at least one message*.

Independent claim 22, as amended, recites *determining whether content of the at least one message includes text, one or more images, one or more sounds, one or more videos, one or more URLs, embedded content, one or more attachments, or one or more applets offensive to the user; and enabling the a user to preview the at least one message in at least a preview pane while preventing the user from sensing the content of the at least one message*

*determined to be offensive to the user when the junk score exceeds a threshold.* It is readily apparent that Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* fail to teach or suggest the novel features recited in claim 22.

Independent claim 34, as amended, recites *means for determining whether content of at least one message includes text, one or more images, one or more sounds, one or more videos, one or more URLs, embedded content, one or more attachments, or one or more applets associated with information deemed offensive to a user; and means for partially blocking the content of the at least one message associated with information deemed offensive to the user from being presented to the user when the at least one message is displayed in at least a preview pane, based on the junk score.* Applicants' representative respectfully submits that Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* fail to teach or suggest the novel features recited in claim 34.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every features of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 22, and 34 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **VII. Rejection of Claim 11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* in view of Adjaoute (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0009495 A1). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, Wendkos *et al.*, and Adjaoute, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 11. In particular, Adjaoute does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Claim 11 properly depends from claim 1, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **VIII. Rejection of Claims 12-17, 30-33, and 35-37 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 12-17, 30-33, and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* in view of Andrews *et al.* (U.S.

Patent Publication No. 2003/0204569). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: claims 14, 31-33, and 35-37 have been canceled; and Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, Wendkos *et al.*, and Andrews *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claims 12-13, 15-17, and 30. In particular, Andrews *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1 and 22. Claims 12-13 and 15-17 properly depend from claim 1, and are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. Claim 30 properly depends from claim 22, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **IX. Rejection of Claim 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* in view of Malik *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0080889). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason: Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, Wendkos *et al.*, and Malik *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 29. In particular, Malik *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Rajan *et al.*, Daniell, and Wendkos *et al.* with respect to independent claim 22. Claim 29 properly depends from claim 22, and is patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as is claim 22. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP644US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Keith E. Drabek/

Keith E. Drabek  
Reg. No. 60,757

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
57<sup>TH</sup> Floor, Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731